REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9 and 12 are amended. Support for the claim amendments is found at, for example, Fig. 2, Fig. 6A, Fig. 6B, page 5, lines 17-23, page 11, lines 6-23, and page 34, lines 8-20. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims at least in light of the following remarks.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Nguyen and Supervisory Examiner Poon in the March 21 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,287,194 (Lobiondo) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,900,448 (Thompson); claims 2, 6, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo in view of Thompson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,594,653 (Akiyama); and claims 3-5 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobiondo in view of Thompson, further in view of well known art. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 9 and 12 are revised for clarity. In particular, these claims each recite a plurality of devices including at least an image forming device (such as element 12 in Fig. 2), a control device which controls the image forming device (such as computer 14 in Fig. 2 and described on page 11, lines 6-23), an input device which inputs data (such as print control device 16 in Fig. 2 and described on page 11, lines 6-23 or a scanner, fax or mail server as described on page 13, lines 18-25) and a communication controller (such as communication control device 18 in Fig. 2). When the input device (such as the print control device in Fig. 6A) transfers an input image, it is transferred via the communication controller without routing through the control device (computer 14) as shown, for example in Fig. 6A.

Additionally, these claims recite that the image forming device forms an image including a code, and the device includes a sensor for reading the code from the formed image and performing a matching check (page 34, lines 8-20).

As discussed during the personal interview, Lobiondo and Thompson, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "the input device transfers the image data to a selected image forming device via the communication control device without routing through the control device when a command is input to the input device," as recited in amended claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that Thompson teaches that "the control device transfers the image data to a selected image forming device via the communication control device, when requested." However, Thompson's scanner is interfaced with a computer to communicate over a network or the Internet. The scanner cannot transfer data over the network or the Internet without going through the host computer. Further, Thompson cannot initiate a command to print from the scanner. Thompson only commands to print from the host computer.

Further, as discussed during the personal interview, Lobiondo and Thompson, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "the selected image forming device includes, a sensor for reading the code from the formed image, the image forming device comparing the formed image with the image data for matching check using the code," as recited in amended claim 1.

Instead, Thompson discloses that image data is compared to data stored in the nonvolatile memory 39, the stored data includes predetermined or premeasured reflectance values of the several portions of the calibration strip 27, and that the calibration circuit then produces an offset and gain correction data by comparing the signal from each of the sensors pixels with the stored predetermined data value for the calibration strip. Thus, Thompson does not check matching between the two images, and does not use a code for the checking.

Accordingly, claims 1, 9 and 12 and dependent claims therefrom are patentable over Lobiondo and Thompson. Akiyama and the well known art fail to overcome the deficiencies of Lobiondo and Thompson.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:SPC/amw

Date: April 24, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461